

Interim Guidance for Standing Review Board (SRB) Implementation
Effective Immediately for Space Flight Programs and Projects

(12/21/06)

This guidance is written to assist the SRBs, mission directorates (MDs), programs, projects, Centers, and review organizations planning for an independent review prior to the distribution of the SRB Handbook. The SRB Handbook's expected release is in the second quarter of calendar year 2007. Please reference NPR 7120.5D and Center procedural requirements that govern the program and project management and review processes. Note: Programs and projects are required to document in review plans the names and timing of their life cycle reviews identified in NPR 7120.5D.

1. The Center Director (CD) initiates the process for standing up a project SRB by nominating a chairperson along with qualifications/rationale to the Technical Authority, if not the CD, Decision Authority (DA), MD Associate Administrator (MDAA), if not the DA, and the AA Program Analysis and Evaluation, referred to collectively as the approving authorities. Initiation of a program SRB is done by the MD. Each approval authority may add chairperson nominations for negotiation and approval.
2. The Review manager (RM) assignment should be added with the chairperson nominations to be approved simultaneously.
3. The chairperson and RM will be funded by an independent account and all other members will be funded by the program or project. If the chairperson is not a civil servant, the RM will develop a statement of work and gain concurrence with the MD and host Center.
4. The chairperson, with support from the RM, works with the approval authority organizations to organize the review board and submit the names of proposed board members for approval/concurrence.
5. SRB members are selected based on competency, current or recent experience as a practitioner, and independence, with emphasis on competency. SRB members must be independent of the program and project and some members (approximately half) must be independent of the Center(s) hosting the program or project. "Independent" means outside the advocacy chain of the program or project.
6. The level of effort should be clearly articulated to candidate SRB members by the RM prior to selection. SRB members will commit to preparation in advance and should be familiar with the objectives and process for each review as described in the Terms of Reference (ToR), NPR 7120.5D, and Center procedural requirements.
7. The SRB's role is advisory to the program or project and the convening authorities, and does not have authority over any program or project content.
8. The SRB remains intact, with the goal of having the same core membership for the duration of the program or project, although it may be augmented over time with specialized reviewers as needed.
9. The convening authority should ensure that for programs and associated projects whether tightly coupled or not, the SRB membership is shared between program and project SRBs to optimize efficiency and effectiveness, e.g. project SRB chairperson membership on the program SRB.
10. The RM is responsible for facilitating the creation of all ToRs with the approval authority organizations and submittal for approval. An original ToR will be developed and include the life cycle of reviews to be completed for the overall program or project. Sub-ToRs for each individual life cycle review will be addendums to the original ToR.
11. The program or project will provide data as required to support review preparation consistent with the ToR.
12. When a SRB member attends a program or project internal decisional review or meeting, they will be considered ex-officio (non-voting), to ensure their continued independence.
13. SRB members will write Request for Actions (RFAs) during their review, as well as findings and recommendations in the reporting process. The SRB RFA process can be part of the existing Center process for those Centers that have this in place; other Centers will need to develop a closed-loop process to track, disposition, and close RFAs. The chairperson and the RFA initiator must concur with the closure of RFAs. The chairperson has ultimate authority on the closure of an RFA.
14. Following each review, the chairperson, with support from the RM, issues a board report within 30 days or as specified in the ToR for the review and each such report is submitted to the relevant individuals, starting with the program or project, along with recommended actions.

This guidance is anticipated to be close to the final handbook; however, it may be subject to change. Please refer to the following website for the most recent versions of these guiding principles: <http://ipao.larc.nasa.gov/index.cfm> or contact Tim Flores at 757-864-9154 or timothy.j.flores@nasa.gov.